

Appl. No. 10/064,736  
Amdt. dated 10/24/05  
Reply to Office action of 09/23/2005

### REMARKS / ARGUMENTS

The Applicants thank the Office for the careful consideration given to their application in the communication mailed 09/23/2005. In that communication, the Office required a restriction to either claims 1 – 24 drawn to a method, or claims 25 – 36 drawn to an apparatus. Claims 7, 11 – 16, and 20 – 24 were rejected under 103(a) as being unpatentable over Skelley et al. (US 5,316,737) taken with Dahlstrom et al. (US 3,873,532). Claims 8 and 17 were rejected under 103(a) as being unpatentable over Skelley et al. taken with Dahlstrom et al. further in view of Hwang et al. (US 6,136,284). Claims 4 – 6 were rejected under 103(a) as being unpatentable over Dahlstrom et al. taken with Hasegawa et al. (US 6,203,598) or alternatively over Hasegawa et al. taken with Dahlstrom et al. Claims 9 – 10 and 18 – 19 were objected to as being dependent upon a rejected claim base. Claims 1 – 3 were allowed.

Applicants hereby affirm the election of claims 1 – 24, and withdraw claims 25 – 36.

Applicants hereby cancel rejected claims 4 – 8, 11 – 17, and 20 – 24. Claims 9 – 10 and 18 – 19 are now rewritten in independent form including all the limitations of the base claim and intervening claims, and therefore should be allowable. Applicants suggest that all remaining claims are allowable, and respectfully request that a Notice of Allowance be issued in this case.

Respectfully submitted,



Date: October 24, 2005  
Tel. No. 603-766-1910  
Fax No. 603-766-1901

Phillip E. Decker, Reg. No. 39,163  
Attorney for Applicant  
1 New Hampshire Ave., Suite 125  
Portsmouth, NH 03801